REMARKS

Claims 28, 29 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hazra et al. (5,787,154) in view of Tasaki et al. (4,879,744). Claim 28 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 29. Claim 29 has been cancelled. As amended, claim 28 calls for the memory of the calling card having stored therein a predetermined message for substitution in place of the respective caller ID value of a telephone at which the calling card is used. Hazra has nothing to do with caller ID values of a telephone. Thus, the combination of Hazra and Tasaki does not teach every limitation of claim 28.

For example, Hazra has a universal authenticator (UA) that communicates with an authentication system, which can be a switch, PBX or other communications network element. The UA is card-like and can be used in conjunction with a telephone. See Figures 2-5. In fact, the communications between the UA and the authentication system take place through the telephone. However, the telephone proper has nothing to do with the authentication system outlined by Hazra. That is, authentication via Hazra is between the UA and the switch, which use the telephone as a medium for communication only. For example, the authentication system generates an input number. See Figure 6, element 507. That input number is communicated to the UA. See Figure 6, element 515. The input number is interspersed with a sequence ID for the UA to generate an output. See Figure 6, element 525. The output number is then communicated back to the authentication system. See Figure 6, element 531. Thus, any input or output number generated is merely associated with the universal authenticator and has nothing to do with identifying a particular telephone. As such, Hazra does not teach substituting a predetermined message in place of a caller ID value for a telephone at which the calling card is used.

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hazra in view of Tasaki and in further view of Longo (5,912,956). Longo is determined as teaching a plurality of preprogrammed custom ID messages for a finder or caller to select for the purpose of reaching the respective destination terminal. See Office Action, page 3. However, it is respectfully pointed out that the identification tags described by Longo do not have a memory

stored thereon. For example, Figure 1 of Longo shows a system that has a telephone switch, a controller, and a voice synthesizer. The controller is also a processor that includes a memory device. See column 5, lines 49-55. Data stored in the memory device includes telephone numbers, associations between speed dial prompt numbers, stored telephone numbers, time remaining values and the like. *Id.* Thus, a subscriber to the service provided by Longo dials in to the system to change data stored in the memory , which is located remote from the tags. See column 4, lines 50-55. Thus, neither the identification tags nor the master card found in Longo's system has a memory associated with them. As such, Longo does not provide a memory on a telephone calling card that has stored therein a plurality of predetermined messages for substitution in place of the respective caller ID value.

New claims 34 and 40 are for telephone calling cards comprising a memory having stored therein a plurality of predetermined messages. As indicated, Longo does not have a plurality of predetermined messages stored on a card.

In view of these remarks, the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. If there are any questions concerning either the amendments or the new claims, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0785US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 28, 2003

Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024
(713) 468-8880 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]